disagreement on these questions to be resolved before the appeal is taken up for decision by the Board.

(5) *Summary of Invention.* A concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal. This explanation is required to refer to the specification by page and line number, and, if there is a drawing, to the drawing by reference characters. Where applicable, it is preferable to read the appealed claims on the specification and any drawing. While reference to page and line number of the specification may require somewhat more detail than simply summarizing the invention, it is considered important to enable the Board to more quickly determine where the claimed subject matter is described in the application.

(6) *Issues.* A concise statement of the issues presented for review. Each stated issue should correspond to a separate ground of rejection which appellant wishes the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to review. While the statement of the issues must be concise, it should not be so concise as to omit the basis of each issue. For example, the statement of an issue as "Whether claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable" would not comply with 37 CFR 1.192(c)(6). Rather, the basis of the alleged unpatentability would have to be stated, e.g., "Whether claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Smith in view of Jones," or "Whether claims 1 and 2 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being based on a nonenabling disclosure." The statement would be limited to the issues presented, and should not include any argument concerning the merits of those issues.

(7) *Grouping of Claims.* For each ground of rejection which appellant contests and which applies to a group of two or more claims, the Board shall select a single claim from the group and shall decide the appeal as to the ground of rejection on the basis of that claim alone, unless a statement is included that the claims of the group do not stand or fall together and, in the argument section of the brief (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)), appellant explains why the claims of the group are believed to be separately patentable. Merely pointing out differences in what the claims cover is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable. If an appealed ground of rejection applies to more than one claim and appellant considers the rejected claims to be separately patentable, 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) requires appellant to state that the claims do not stand or fall together, and to present in the appropriate part or parts of the argument under 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8) the reasons why they are considered separately patentable.

The absence of such a statement and argument is a concession by the applicant that, if the ground of rejection were sustained as to any one of the rejected claims, it will be equally applicable to all of them. 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) is consistent with the practice of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit indicated in such cases as *In re Young*, 927 F.2d 588, 18 USPQ2d 1089 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Nielsen*, 816 F.2d 1567, 2 USPQ2d 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *In re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *In re Sernaker*, 702 F.2d 989, 217 USPQ 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983). 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) requires the inclusion of reasons in order to avoid unsupported assertions of separate patentability. The reasons may be included in the appropriate portion of the "Argument" section of the brief. For example, if claims 1 to 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 and appellant considers claim 4 to be separately patentable from claims 1 to 3, he or she should so state in the "Grouping of claims" section of the brief, and then give the reasons for separate patentability in the 35 U.S.C. 102 portion of the "Argument" section (i.e., under 37 CFR 1.192(c) (8) (iii)).

In the absence of a separate statement that the claims do not stand or fall together, the Board panel assigned to the case will normally select the broadest claim in a group and will consider only that claim, even though the group may contain two broad claims, such as "ABCDE" and "ABCDF." The same would be true in a case where there are both broad method and apparatus claims on appeal in the same group. The rationale behind the rule, as amended, is to make the appeal process as efficient as possible. Thus, while the Board will consider each separately argued claim, the work of the Board can be done in a more efficient manner by selecting a single claim from a group of claims when the appellant does not meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

It should be noted that 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) requires the appellant to perform two affirmative acts in his or her brief in order to have the separate patentability of a plurality of claims subject to the same rejection considered. The appellant must (A) state that the claims do not stand or fall together and (B) present arguments why the claims subject to the same rejec-

EXHIBIT C